UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,699	10/30/2006	David Mark Whiley	00633-8004.US00	2939

90615 7590 01/06/2011

Fisher Adams Kelly
Perkins Coie LLP. 700 13th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005-3960

EXAMINER	
ZEMAN, ROBERT A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1645	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/06/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jisacson@perkinscoie.com
dmayhew@perkinscoie.com
patentprocurement@perkinscoie.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/599,699	WHILEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ROBERT A. ZEMAN	1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 October 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *24-26,29-31,33-35 and 48-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *35 and 48* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *24-26,29,31,34,49 and 51-53* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *30,33 and 50* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☒ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed on 10-14-2010 is acknowledged. Claims 24, 26, 29-31, 33 and 35 have been amended. Claims 27-28, 32 and 36-47 have been canceled. Claims 48-53 have been added. Claims 24-26, 29-31, 33-35 and 48-53 are pending and currently under examination.

Priority

Applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Australia on 4-8-2004 is deemed to be perfected.

Sequence Compliance

In light of the amendment to the specification filed on 10-14-2010, this application now complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.821-1.825.

Claim Rejections Withdrawn

The rejection of claims 24-29 and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is withdrawn in lieu of the rejection set forth below

The rejection of claims 24-35 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for methods of determining whether an individual is actively infected with Neisseria gonorrhoeae utilizing the PCR primers consisting of the sequences of SEQ ID NO: 1 and 2, does not reasonably provide enablement for methods of determining

whether an individual has previously been infected with Neisseria gonorrhoeae is withdrawn in light of the amendment thereto.

The rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being rendered vague and indefinite by the use of the phrase "having a nucleotide sequence..." is withdrawn in light of the amendment thereto.

The rejection of claims 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being rendered vague and indefinite by the use of the phrase "has a nucleotide sequence..."is withdrawn in light of the amendment thereto.

The rejection of claim 35 is rendered vague and indefinite by the use of the phrase "nucleotide sequences according to SEQ ID NO..." is withdrawn in light of the amendment thereto.

Claims 24-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Whilley et al. (European Journal of Microbial Infectious Diseases, 2004, Vol. 23 pages 705-710 -- IDS filed on 10-5-2006) is withdrawn.

New Grounds of Objection

Claims 30, 33 and 50 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected claim

New Grounds of Rejection

35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 24-26, 29, 31, 34, 49 and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

The instant claims are drawn to methods of determining whether an individual is infected with Neisseria gonorrhea utilizing primers that facilitate amplification of a porA nucleic acid comprising residues 681-812 of SEQ ID NO:10; wherein said methods allow for the amplification of Neisseria gonorrhea porA nucleic acids but not Neisseria meningitidis (or any other Neisserial) porA nucleic acids (claims 25-26 and 29); and the further use of oligonucleotide probes for detecting said amplified porA nucleic acids.

The specification discloses SEQ ID NO:1 and 2 that correspond to PCR primers specific for the porA gene of Neisseria gonorrhoeae but no other Neisserial species. SEQ ID NO:1 and 2 meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Contrary to Applicant's assertion, the number of primers encompassed by the instant claims is not small as the aforementioned claims are drawn to any and all PCR primers that hybridize to the residues 681-812 of SEQ ID NO:10, the porA gene of Neisseria gonorrhoeae but not Neisseria meningitidis (claims 25 and 29) or any other Neisserial species (claim 26). None of these sequences meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first

paragraph. The specification provides insufficient written description to support the genus encompassed by the claim.

Additionally claims 31, 34, 49 and 51 required the use of oligonucleotide probes to detect the amplified porA product. The specification discloses SEQ ID NO:3 and 4 that correspond to oligonucleotide probes specific for specific for the porA gene of Neisseria gonorrhoeae but no other Neisserial species. SEQ ID NO:3 and 4 meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Contrary to Applicant's assertion, the number of primers encompassed by the instant claims is not small as the aforementioned claims are drawn to any and all oligonucleotide probes that hybridize to, a porA nucleic acid (comprising residues 681-812 of SEQ ID NO:10) of Neisseria gonorrhoeae but not Neisseria meningitidis (claims 25 and 29) or any other Neisserial species (claim 26). None of these sequences meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The specification provides insufficient written description to support the genus encompassed by the claim.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, whatever is now claimed." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.)

With the exception of SEQ ID NO.1-4, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed polynucleotides that convey the species specificity required by the instant claims. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. The nucleic acid itself is required. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. In Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Finally, University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404. 1405 held that:

...To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and does so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." Lockwood v. American Airlines Inc. , 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); In re Gosteli , 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (" [T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." Lockwood, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2datl966.

An adequate written description of a DNA, such as the cDNA of the recombinant plasmids and microorganisms of the '525 patent, "requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties," not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. Fiers v. Revel, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, "an adequate written description of a DNA requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the DNA itself." Id. at 1170, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

The name cDNA is not itself a written description of that DNA; it conveys no distinguishing information concerning its identity. While the example provides a process for obtaining human insulin-encoding cDNA, there is no further information in the patent pertaining to that cDNA's relevant structural or physical characteristics; in other words, it thus does not describe human insulin cDNA. Describing a method of preparing a cDNA or even describing the protein that the cDNA encodes, as the example does, does not necessarily describe the cDNA itself. No sequence information indicating which nucleotides constitute human cDNA appears in the patent, as appears for rat cDNA in Example 5 of the patent. Accordingly, the specification does not provide a written description of the invention of claim 5.

Therefore, only SEQ ID NO: 1-4, but not the full breadth of the claims meets the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The species specifically disclosed are not representative of the genus because the genus is highly variant. Applicant is reminded that Vas-Cath makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision. (See page 1115.)

Conclusion

Claims 24-26, 29, 31, 34, 49 and 51-53 are rejected.

Claims 35 and 48 are allowed.

Claims 30, 33 and 50 are objected to.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT A. ZEMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-0866. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Thursday, 7am -5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, Patricia Duffy can be reached on (571) 272-0855. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert A. Zeman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645
January 3, 2011